

**AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS**

The attached sheets of drawing include changes to Figures 14 and 15. The attached sheets which include Figures 14 and 15, replaces the original sheets containing Figures 14 and Figures 15. In both Figure 14 and 15, the caption legend "PRIOR ART" has been added.

Attachment: Replacement Drawings

## REMARKS

### A. Background

Claims 1-15 were pending in the application at the time of the Office Action. The Office Action objected to the specification and drawings on formal grounds. Claims 1, 5, and 7 were rejected as being anticipated over cited prior art. Claims 2-4 and 6-15 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. By this response applicant has amended the specification and drawings so as to address the formal issues. Applicant has also amended claim 1 and cancelled claims 6, 12, and 13. As such, claims 1-5, 7-11, 14, and 15 are presented for the Examiner's consideration in light of the following remarks.

### B. Proposed Amendments

Paragraphs 35 and 36 of the specification have been amended to replace "multiplayer" with "multilayer." Figures 14 and 15 have been amended to recite the caption "PRIOR ART." Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of claim 6. In view of the foregoing, applicant respectfully submits that the amendments to the drawings, specification, and claims do not introduce new matter and entry thereof is respectfully requested.

### C. Rejection on the Merits

Page 2 of the Office Action requested that Figures 14 and 15 be amended to include the legend "PRIOR ART." Applicant herein amended Figures 14 and 15 to include the requested legend.

Page 2 of the Office Action requested that Paragraphs 35 and 36 be amended to address an informality. Applicant has herein amended the specification as requested in the Office Action.

Pages 2-3 of the Office Action rejected claims 1, 5, and 7 under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Japanese Application No. 8-190026. Page 3 of the Office Action states that claims 2-4 and 6-15 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. By this response applicant has amended claim 1 so as to incorporate the limitations of claim 6. As such, applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 6 was considered to be allowable in the Office Action. As such, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 is respectfully requested. The remaining claims 2-5, 7-11, 14, and 15 depend from claim 1 and thus incorporate the limitations thereof. As such, applicant respectfully submits that claims 2-5, 7-11, 13, and 15 are allowable over the cited prior art for at least the same reasons as discussed above with regard to claim 1.

No other objections or rejections are set forth in the Office Action.

D. Conclusion

Applicant notes that this response does not discuss every reason why the claims of the present application are distinguished over the cited prior art. Most notably, applicant submits that many if not all of the dependent claims are independently distinguishable over the cited prior art. Applicant has merely submitted those arguments which it considers sufficient to clearly distinguish the claims over the cited prior art.

In view of the foregoing, applicant respectfully requests the Examiner's reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-5, 7-11, 14, and 15 as amended and presented herein.

In the event there remains any impediment to allowance of the claims which could be clarified in a telephonic interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to initiate such an interview with the undersigned.

Dated this 29<sup>th</sup> day of January 2007.

Respectfully submitted,

/Dana L. Tangren/ Reg. # 37246  
DANA L. TANGREN

Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 37,246  
Customer No. 022913  
Telephone No. 801.533.9800

DLT:dfw  
W:\14321\73\DFW0000021274V001.DOC